Vol. IX, No. 47 HUMAN EVENTS November 19, 1952

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED DEC 2 '52 LIBRARY

CONSERVATIVES CAN STAY IN POWER I—

By J. HARVIE WILLIAMS

AFTER twenty long years the "Roosevelt Revolution" has been brought to at least a temporary halt. The election of Eisenhower poses a question for the conservatives — of both parties — who helped to bring it about: has this "revolution" been stopped or will the next four years prove to be merely a respite? The answer lies with the conservatives themselves. If during this Eisenhower regime they reorganize and consolidate their forces, they can prevent a return of the New and Fair Deals; and the first step in planning their strategy is to assess the victory at the polls for what it really was, not what it seems to be.

The Eisenhower victory was not a "landslide". The 442 to 89 division of the Presidential Electors (83.2 per cent to 16.8) is not a reliable measure of the results of the elections. A more accurate measure is the division of the popular vote. Here, Eisenhower has 55.5 per cent to 44.5 per cent for Stevenson, of the major-party vote. Presidents Harding, Coolidge and Hoover each did far better in the year of his election; and Hoover won two more Republican Electors than Eisenhower.

Nor is the Eisenhower success a *Republican* victory; the best that can be said for it is that it was a Truman defeat, or an expression of popular conservatism. With the strongest Presidential candidate since Herbert Hoover in 1928, the *party* was able to win only technical control of the Congress. In the Senate the Republicans will have exactly half of the 96 seats, and may have to depend on the tie-breaking vote of Vice President-to-be Richard Nixon to gain the necessary majority. When the final results are officially reported on the contests for seats in the House of Representatives the Republicans will have from three to five more than half of the members.

Acts of God could easily shift such a thin margin of congressional control from the Republicans to the Democrats. During its two-year life, the normal occurrence of vacancies in the 83rd Congress, their filling by special election or by appointment, may transfer control from the Republicans to the Democrats in either or both Houses. In that event President Eisenhower will be faced with a Congress led by Truman supporters.

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus, the close division between the parties in the Congress-elect points up the necessity of an early party realignment; or, more exactly, a formal Southern Democrat-Republican *alliance.* The Republican party is no longer strong enough, even if it were all conservative, to reflect the strength of conservatives in the nation-wide electorate.

The additional source of conservative strength in Congress is the South. The eleven States have 22 United States Senators and 106 Representatives. They are overwhelmingly conservative. All of these Senators and 100 of the Representatives were elected as "Democrats". In the recent elections the Republicans added to their two long-held East Tennessee seats four additional House seats, three in Virginia and one in North Carolina. No more than one of these newly won seats is apt to be held through the 1954 elections. The South will remain "Democratic".

THE PROBLEM OF PARTY realignment depends on the forging of such a formal alliance in Congress between the conservative Republicans and the conservative Southern Democrats, an alliance that will join them together in the organized majority of each House just as though they were members of the same party. In Congress we would see Byrd, George, Cox and Howard Smith working shoulder to shoulder with Taft, Bridges, Martin, Halleck and Brown, to name but a few.

The Republicans, if formal control slips from them, can be expected to make some move along these lines. They may well, under such circumstances, become so anxious to regain the many prerogatives of majority status, committee chairmanships and the additional power that goes with membership in a legislative majority, that they will take the initiative and invite the Southern Democrats into a formal alliance.

The main obstacle to this step is *prerogative.* When the Republicans are in the majority in either Senate or House they make up the legislative program and schedule the business to be acted upon on the floor. More important, Republicans make up the majority on each standing committee and the committee chairman is a Republican. This powerful figure guides the work of the committee, appoints subcommittees to hold hearings on proposed legislation, shapes up the committee reports and handles the bills on the floor. From the hundreds of bills introduced by members that have been referred to his committee he selects the relatively few to be considered, pigeonholing the others. Thus he has what is sometimes called "the power of life and death" over proposed legislation. Legislative bodies are very reluctant to overrule their committees.

Once it is understood that the overwhelming bulk of legislative work is done in committee, and that this work is done by the majority members under the direction of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

committee chairman, it will be seen why minority-status is shunned, and why committee chairmanships are highly prized positions. One member of Congress has said: "Membership in a legislative minority is the lowest form of political life."

Prerogative, then, is a main stumbling block to the early formation of a formal alliance in Congress between Republicans and Southern Democrats. When the Democrats were in the majority the Southern members had majority status and a goodly number of the choice committee chairmanships. To have formed an alliance with the Republican minority at that time would have cost them some of their chairmanships, these going to Republicans having higher seniority. But, on the other hand, all would have retained their status in the *new* majority — a precious thing. Today, even with the thin margin of their majority, certain Republicans are the ones who would have to make the sacrifices of giving up their committee chairmanships to more senior Southern Democrats, if an alliance is to be formed.

IT IS THE present touch and go situation in regard to control of the Houses of Congress that makes party realignment there an early possibility. And the danger of the Republicans losing control is not limited to the life of this Congress. The 1954 elections can cost them several of the seventeen House seats which they have just won by fewer than one thousand votes.

Republicans will have to weigh the alternatives. Loss of Republican control of both Houses of Congress would mean the loss of fifteen committee chairmanships in the Senate and nineteen in the House of Representatives. Every Republican member would lose majority-status. On the other hand, under a formal alliance between Republicans and Southern Democrats the GOP would lose only about half of the chairmanships. Yet in these cases, the unfortunate GOP ex-chairman would stand to regain the No. 1 committee position in case of retirement or death of the Democratic chairman. And the valuable majority status for Republican members would be assured for a generation. As for the Southern Democrats, under this arrangement they would all gain majority-status — unless they had some exclusions they wished to make — and certain of them would be restored to their recent committee chairmanships.

Thus organized, the Republican-Southern Democrat alliance could over the years be reasonably expected to hold more than sixty seats in the Senate, a comfortable working majority. In the House of Representatives the alliance could count on two hundred and fifty members, also a safe majority. These are minimum estimates based on the elections since 1936.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was the failure to solve this congressional problem which prevented Ike from winning the whole South in the recent election. Southern Democratic members of Congress did not stump for him principally because they feared loss of that precious majority status on Capitol Hill. The Presidency four years hence may hinge on solution of this problem.

Should it not be solved by 1956, the "Roosevelt Coalition" which brought on the "Roosevelt Revolution" — according to Samuel Lubell in his extraordinary book, *The Future of American Politics* — may be so revamped as to win the Presidency in the next contest. In fact, Lubell suggested that one defeat for the "Roosevelt Coalition" might be necessary to firm up the lines that held it together. Once again returned to power (with a Congressional majority) the "Roosevelt Revolution" would be completed, he maintains.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON said:

> "We are laboring hard to establish in this country principles more and more *national,* and free from all foreign ingredients, so that we may be neither 'Greeks nor Trojans', but truly Americans."

These "truly Americans", the conservatives (regardless of party affiliation), feel rather than know that their institutions of *personal* liberty and *national* independence are under indirect attack, in the name of "security", personal and national.

The political problem of these "truly Americans" lies in the fact that they are now separated in Congress by party labels, although they went far towards joining hands in choosing General Eisenhower for President. In the eleven Southern States conservatives are represented in Washington by men elected under the "Democratic" label. In the rest of the country conservatives are almost entirely represented by "Republicans".

Conservatives are in substantial majority in at least 285 of the 435 Congressional Districts. In short, under party realignment, they would hold decisive control of the nation's law-making body.

But the conservative Southern Democrats cannot become "Republicans" in Washington and get re-elected as Democrats in their States and Districts. Nor, can Republicans elect more than a handful of members of Congress in the South for many years to come. They can, however, formally ally themselves together in joint organization of the Senate and House and retain their respective party identities in their own States and Districts.

This formal congressional alignment is a necessity if in 1956 conservatives of both parties wish to align themselves electorally behind a conservative candidate for President.

Such is the nub of the problem of party realignment. Conservatives can stay in power if they solve it in time.

Mr. Williams, born and raised in the Carolinas, went to New York in the late Twenties where he joined and worked for the Republican Party. This year he campaigned for Eisenhower in the South.

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* — FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume IX, No. 47 — Wednesday, Novmber 19, 1952 — Washington, D. C.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED DEC 2 52 LIBRARY

Operation Marx: General Eisenhower, avowed foe of socialism, will undoubtedly be startled to discover (when he takes office) that promotion of socialism is the keystone of our political policy in Europe today. Not only in philosophic concept but also in concrete operations, our course has for some time been guided by efforts (1) to put socialist or statist elements in power and keep them there wherever possible; and (2) to replace conservative with such socialist or statist governments.

We have uncovered this picture after months of investigation. Our researches leave us convinced of the truth of a story which at first we were reluctant to credit. Because the paths of our investigation led to the inner recesses of the State Department and allied agencies, we can disclose no names of persons, or of the extraordinary highly secret councils which presume to wield such power.

It should be said that none of this activity, or the principals involved, has any connection with the Communist network. The principal directors are a hodge-podge of anti-Stalinist socialists, statists and plain power-hungry opportunists.

The picture of this activity may be divided into two parts: (1) basic thinking of the planners; and (2) action.

(1) Believe it or not, this is the thinking which gives rise to this pro-statist and pro-socialist policy in Europe. The planners (described above) envisage the end of the "cold war" (or, indeed, of a "hot war") as a period of great danger, with disintegration or destruction of Soviet regimes in Eastern Europe. They fear that new succession governments would be "reactionary" or "fascistic". They believe that "liberal" or "socialistic" regimes should take over and that our assistance and preparations now should be given to such groups-in-exile. As for Western European states, these planners believe that the maximum resistance to Soviet Communist infiltration will be obtained by backing socialist governments, or by forcing if possible statist or socialist elements into such Western European governments. Only governments vowed to "social reform" and "redistribution of wealth" can successfully overcome the Soviet menace — the planners assert.

Incredible as it may seem to our readers, the planners never entertain the view that these proposed "liberal" and socialistic regimes would prove to be the really "reactionary" ones from any American or indeed historical point of view. Indeed, our investigation suggests that these planners fear the emergence of a free economy in Eastern Europe more than they fear Communism.

That this thinking and planning has not been completely *in vacuo* appears from one remark of an informant within the Government: "This is the concept which has prevented any effective aid to anti-Communist elements in Russia and the satellite countries." Also, current talk about a "national Communist" internationale under Tito leadership is another fruit of the ideas of these planners.

(2) The activities to implement this extraordinary policy are the creation and subsidization, from U.S. Government secret funds, of socialist "front" committees, trade unions and various groups in Western European countries. We have been unable to obtain complete statistics of such funds expended. But, some estimates place the total between $20,000,000 and $30,000,000.

One amazing aspect of this picture is that we have thus been trespassing on the sovereignty of nations with whom we pretend to maintain friendly relations. This can hardly be in accord with the ideas

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the President-designate, who tried to use great tact during his recent mission to Europe. But, above all, Dwight D. Eisenhower can scarcely countenance any longer a policy which is in direct conflict with his often expressed opposition to statism and socialism.

Mission to Korea: General Eisenhower's trip to Korea is bound to have important effects on a world scale, for better or worse, say diplomatic circles in the Capital. It could prove a huge success and bring wide foreign repercussions favorable to our world position. Or it could turn out to be a failure with negative psychological effects throughout the globe.

Hence, old China hands in the Capital have been speculating on what measures the General could take while he is in the Far East. One suggestion is that while out there he call a conference (perhaps in Okinawa) of "Free Peoples of Asia" — composed of Chiang Kai-shek, President Rhee of Korea, Premier Yoshida of Japan, representatives from the Philippine Republic and Indonesia. Such a meeting by its very appearance, regardless of agreements reached at it, should have a favorable psychological effect on all Asia.

Another suggestion is that the U.S. should declare "free trade with the Chinese people". Considerable illicit trade, by-passing Red Chinese Government controls, has been going on for some time. This trade — it is believed — could be encouraged and financed by the U.S. Also, if the free countries were to pay for China goods, thus smuggled out, with silver dollars (from our hoard of Government-owned silver), the appearance of this hard currency again in China might have a good effect. China traditionally used silver, although in recent years these dollars have virtually disappeared. Seeing it again in circulation might bolster the morale of the Chinese people in their fight against their Red Masters.

Dewey: Governor Thomas E. Dewey has decided to finish his term in Albany (two years to run) and has declined to accept a post in Eisenhower's cabinet. The President-designate in his statement says that Dewey "has promised to be available for consultation and advice and for any future work of an emergency or temporary character". So the door is apparently open for Dewey on some occasion in the next four years to serve the GOP Federal regime.

The motive of Dewey in this course is the cause of no little speculation. The best guess we have heard is as follows: Dewey still has his ambitious gaze riveted not on a Cabinet post, but on the Presidency. He would finish out his term in Albany and then take a job, either in the Cabinet or elsewhere in the Ike regime, with a high visibility in the national scene during the two years preceding the next election.

But meanwhile, he would retain his hold on the New York state political machine — and therefore on the New York delegation to the 1956 convention — through a hand-picked successor. That successor, it is believed, would be the present Lieutenant Governor Frank C. Moore. This official is presently considered a loyal Dewey follower. But supposing Moore as Governor should prove highly popular and ambitious and likely Presidential timber himself? Dewey has presumably thought of that. He would pick Moore as his successor in Albany because Moore is not a natural born American citizen. He was born in Canada, and is therefore ineligible for the Presidency.

Spain: Dictator Franco is anxious to cooperate with the U.S. in establishing U.S. air and naval bases in his country — according to a piece by Constantine Brown, Foreign Editor of the Washington *Evening Star*, who has just returned from a journalistic visit to Spain.

Brown's statement directly contradicts rumors to the contrary appearing in various portions of the U.S. press. These reports allege that Franco has been demanding an exorbitant price for his cooperation and has shown more interest in financial and economic assistance from us than in the overall strategic picture.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"A careful investigation of these reports with the best informed American sources here shows that there is not the slightest foundation for these 'inspired' rumors", says Brown. Since Mr. Lincoln MacVeagh, veteran diplomat, is present U.S. Ambassador in Madrid and since there is a large military mission in that capital, presumably these are the sources. It is well known here that the State Department views rapproachement with Madrid and military assistance to Spain with a jaundiced eye — which offers a clue to the origin of the "inspired" rumors mentioned by Brown.

The American journalist nails another "rumor", i.e., that Franco has been seeking to exploit our need for bases in order to pry Spain into NATO and UN. Brown states: "He (Franco) is interested in an agreement with America above anything else. He seeks admission neither to the United Nations nor to NATO, not only because he knows Spain would be blackballed but also because he has little faith in the capabilities of these heterogeneous organizations in opposing Red Imperialism."

Digging in: "If you want to buy a farm, get in line". So begins an article by Lee Geist, in the *Wall Street Journal*. Continuing, "For every seller there are two would-be buyers — and most of the customers are city slickers".

The primordial pangs of land-hunger are at our innards again. This time, however, it is not the urge for sustenance that is driving urbanites to bid up farms to as much as $500 an acre — a price not warranted by the yield of the land, even at the subsidized prices of commodities — but the expectation that inflation has not yet run its course, and that land values will continue to rise. In other words, land is being bought as a "hedge" against the further depreciation of the dollar. The reasoning behind this bullishness about farm land is something like this: when the 10¢ (1920) ham sandwich sells for $1.00, the land from which the ham and bread must come will go up in proportion, and one who owns land may then be in better position than the coupon clipper to buy a ham sandwich.

These city slickers may be slicker than the farm-sellers think they are. In another item in the financial journal we are told that the U.S. Treasury must dig up $7.9 billion by the 15th of the coming September to meet the two per cent bonds that mature on that date. It will, as usual, resort to various devices to put off the paying of this debt: higher interest rates, shorter maturity dates for the new bonds, etc. But, experience suggests that the public will not absorb all the bonds that are issued to replace the maturing ones, that other investments (like land) will prove to be more attractive than a government bond.

Whatever the public does not buy will be forced on the banks, which will in turn resort to the usual methods of monetizing their bond holdings. That of course, is inflation. In 1954, the U.S. Treasury will have something like $9 billion more to raise — and so on ad infinitum. Meanwhile, the prospect is that the government will blithely continue to spend more money that it collects, thus increasing its debts, which will in one way or another be monetized.

Yes, the prospect is that there will be more money around for some years to come, much more. More money means more bidding for the available commodities (made scarce by government wastage), which means higher prices for ham sandwiches, which means higher prices for land.

Television Front: TV programs have recently been including material which can only be described as anti-German, on a racial basis. Certain shows have been reviving the old war propaganda films which emphasize the inhuman brutality of the Nazis. Whatever might have been said for such films during the emotional stress of the late war, the showing of such films now is likely to revive racial feelings against a people whom we presently seek to win as military allies.

We thought at first that this sort of film revival was a matter of economy, that these old grade-B concoctions were bought because they were cheap, to use as time-fillers that might be chopped up for the insertion of local commercials. But as we went into the matter more thoroughly, we began to see that there is a design on the part of some of the stations in using this material. These stations appear

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be tied in closely with the current pro-Soviet propaganda line pushed by the oh-so-"anti-Communist", "anti-anti-Communist" commentators who regularly wail about "McCarthyism". These scripts convey the emotional impression that all Germans are vicious, sadistic, brutal beasts, incurably Nazi-minded and secretly looking forward to the day when they might grind their heels in the faces of Americans.

This poison is now channelled into an estimated 40-odd million American homes. We believe that it is patently designed to undermine and nullify all NATO plans and all peaceful devices for enlisting German resistance to Soviet aggression, and therefore this matter should quite properly be the concern of the Defense and State Departments.

Education Front: Quite clearly, some alumni of Yale University need severe disciplining. Last spring, a Yale investigating committee charged with examining William F. Buckley Jr.'s charges that collectivism and secularism are rampant at the University, released its report, which was primarily distinguished by its conspicuous failure to join issue with Mr. Buckley on any of the charges he levelled. The Committee closed by upholding academic freedom, and by solemnly affirming that "A University does not take sides on questions that are discussed in its halls. The business of the University is to educate, not indoctrinate its students."

Last week, despite this grave injunction, the New York Yale Club Scholarship Committee sent out its semi-annual appeal for funds. A startling thought was added. Just after the section that states that the "best boys in the entire country must be attracted to Yale", and just before the passage that reminds us that Yale men are "the future leaders of this country", there appears the sentence, "*A Yale education instills self-reliance and offers a counter to the present trend of mass dependence upon the welfare state.*"

Zounds! And Yale isn't supposed to take sides — neither for nor against self-reliance, nor for nor against the welfare state! The Yale Club Scholarship Committee should be reported to the American Association of University Professors, the National Education Association, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the President of Yale. It must be true that McCarthy has gained a toehold in national life when a major educational institution, ostensibly dedicated to academic freedom, is represented as indoctrinating its students in self-reliance!

Between Covers: Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes' trenchant brochure on "The Court Historians versus Revisionism", which aroused much comment when first printed last February, has now been reprinted in an expanded Second Edition.

The treatment of Langer and Gleason's *The Challenge to Isolation* has been elaborated, particularly by adding a pointed characterization of the diplomatic attitudes and methods of Cordell Hull — unique in historical literature to date. Also, a new section about as long as the original brochure has been added on *The Road to Pearl Harbor* by Herbert Feis, the other outstanding "court historian" to defend the Roosevelt-Hull foreign policy.

This Second Edition can be obtained from the American Renaissance Book Club, P.O. Box 1316, Chicago 90, Ill. Price 50 cents.

—— It ought not to be difficult to understand that "political freedom is the corollary of economic freedom" — that you cannot have one without the other. Yet, such is the insanity of our times that this simple truth is being lost sight of. If the writings of Ludwig von Mises do nothing but prevent its obliteration, which would result in losing the sense of freedom, they will have accomplished a service to mankind. For that reason, we welcome the appearance of *Planning for Freedom*, a collection of essays and speeches by this eminent economist. Published by the Libertarian Press, South Holland, Ill., $3.00.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED